

PP-Waves, $\mathcal{M}$ -Theory and Fluxes

Katrin Becker¹

Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0830

Melanie Becker and Ram Sriharsha²

*Department of Physics, University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742-4111*

We study a new type of warped compactifications of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on eight manifolds for which nowhere vanishing covariantly constant spinors of indefinite chirality on the internal manifold can be found. We derive the constraints on the fluxes and the warp factor following from supersymmetry and the equations of motion. We show, that the lift of Type IIB PP-waves to $\mathcal{M}$ -theory is a special type of solution of this general class of models. We comment on the relation between the Type IIB version of such compactifications as a dual description of the Polchinski-Strassler solution describing a four-dimensional confining gauge theory.

July, 2003

¹ `katrin@physics.utah.edu`

² `melanieb@physics.umd.edu` and `harsha@glue.umd.edu`

1. Introduction and Summary

Although warped compactifications have been known in string theory for almost twenty years (see e.g. [1], [2] and [3]) they have become recently an active area of research as it has been realized, that these compactifications are excellent candidates to solve one longstanding problem in string theory, the moduli space problem. Thus they are of great interest from the phenomenological point of view, which is the reason of why these compactifications were considered in the context of the heterotic string in [4], [5] and [6]. For a recent discussion on the subject of counting flux vacua and the moduli space problem in string theory see [7]. Since the internal manifold is in this case non-Kähler and has torsion these models are also attractive from the mathematical point of view [8], [6] and [9]. This is only one of the reasons, of why warped compactifications are fascinating, as there are several connections to other scenarios, that are as surprising and interesting as the previous one.

First, as we shall see in this paper, there is a connection between a generalization of the warped compactifications of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on eight-manifolds considered in [10] and the $\mathcal{M}$ -theory lift of PP-waves of the Type IIB theory considered in [11]. We will show, that the construction of [11] can be viewed as a “compactification” of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on an eight manifold, where the internal manifold is non-compact. Indeed, the models considered in [11] can be thought of as $\mathcal{M}$ -theory compactifications, where the internal manifold admits only self-dual fluxes, differing from [10] by the fact, that the internal spinors are non-chiral. To show the existence of this more general class of models and to derive the generic equations describing them will be the main point of the present paper.

From a different perspective, warped compactifications play also an important role in the description of confining supersymmetric gauge theories and ultimately in the description of QCD. This is because there is a close relation between warped compactifications and Ramond-Ramond backgrounds in string theory. Confining gauge theories can be realized, for example, as perturbations by three-form flux of Type IIB string theory on $AdS_5 \times S_5$. It was shown by Polchinski and Strassler [12], that the three-form flux of the supergravity theory corresponds to a perturbation of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauge theory by mass terms and the resulting gauge theory has $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry [12].

Non-perturbatively, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric gauge theories can be realized by placing D3-branes at conical singularities of a Ricci-flat six-dimensional cone, whose base manifold is a five-dimensional Einstein space X_5 . On the supergravity side one considers the Type IIB theory on $AdS_5 \times X_5$ and this is dual to the world-volume theory of the D3-branes at the singularity. In case that one considers D3-branes on the conifold [13], for example, one would obtain on the worldvolume of the D3-branes a gauge theory with $SU(N) \times SU(N)$ gauge group. Besides considering D3-branes it is also possible to consider D5-branes wrapped on collapsed two-cycles at the singularity [14]. This has the effect, that the D3-brane charge eventually becomes negative and the supergravity metric becomes singular. It was argued by Klebanov and Strassler [15], that this naked singularity of the metric gets resolved in terms of a warped deformed conifold, which is completely non-singular. It was realized later on in [16] and [17], that the Klebanov-Strassler model can be obtained as a special case of the solutions derived in [10] and [18], describing compactifications of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on eight-manifolds. This is interesting and one may wonder, if there is a similar connection between the models considered in [10] or a corresponding generalization thereof and the Polchinski-Strassler model. This would be useful to derive the exact solution of the model considered in [12]. In this paper we will take one step in this direction. We shall consider compactification of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on eight-manifolds for which we can define two covariantly constant spinors on the internal manifold of non-definite chirality. This is one generalization of [10], that is needed in order to make contact with [12].

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2.1 we give a short reminder on compactifications of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on eight-manifolds, where two covariantly constant spinors of definite chirality on the internal manifold can be found. These manifolds are conformally Calabi-Yau. In section 2.2 we discuss the generalization of this type of compactifications to the case, where the spinors on the internal manifold no longer have a definite chirality. In section 3 we discuss a particular example of the models considered herein, namely the $\mathcal{M}$ -theory lift of the PP-wave solution of the Type IIB theory considered in [11] and show, that it obeys the constraints, that we derived in the previous section. In section 4 we give our conclusions and outlook and comment on the relation between the present work as a

dual description of the Polchinski-Strassler model describing a four-dimensional confining gauge theory. In an appendix we collect some of the relevant formulas.

Note Added: While this paper was written there appeared two interesting papers, which have some overlap with the discussion presented herein [19] and [20]. The work of [19] discusses the most general supersymmetric geometries arising in M-Theory compactifications on eight manifolds, when the chirality assumption on the internal spinors is removed.

2. $\mathcal{M}$ -theory Compactifications on Eight Manifolds

In this section we would like to consider compactifications of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory on eight-manifolds and derive the constraints on the fluxes and the warp factor, that follow from supersymmetry and the equations of motion.

2.1. *Reminder: Chiral Spinors on the Internal Space*

Let us start with a short reminder about compactifications with fluxes for which two spinors on the internal space, that are chiral can be found [10], [18]. This will be useful to introduce our notation and will be helpful in order to compare with the non-chiral case discussed afterwards. The bosonic part of the action of the eleven-dimensional supergravity limit of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory is given by [21]

$$\mathcal{S}_{11} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^{11}x \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left[\hat{R} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{F} \wedge * \hat{F} - \frac{1}{6} \hat{C} \wedge \hat{F} \wedge \hat{F} \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where $\hat{g}_{MN}$ is the space-time metric (the hat denotes eleven-dimensional quantities) and $\hat{C}$ is a three-form with field strength $\hat{F} = d\hat{C}$. We have set the gravitational constant equal to one. The complete action is invariant under local supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \hat{e}_M^A &= i \bar{\eta} \hat{\Gamma}^A \psi_M, \\ \delta \hat{C}_{MNP} &= 3i \bar{\eta} \hat{\Gamma}_{[MN} \psi_{P]}, \\ \delta \psi_M &= \hat{\nabla}_M \eta - \frac{1}{288} \left(\hat{\Gamma}_M^{PQRS} - 8 \delta_M^P \hat{\Gamma}^{QRS} \right) \hat{F}_{PQRS} \eta, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\hat{e}_M^A$ is the vielbein, ψ_M is the gravitino, η is an eleven-dimensional anticommuting Majorana spinor and $\hat{\nabla}_M$ denotes the covariant derivative involving the Christoffel connection as usual. Further notations and conventions will be given in the appendix.

The field strength obeys the Bianchi identity

$$d\hat{F} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

or in components $\partial_{[M}\hat{F}_{PQRS]} = 0$. This equation is metric independent. The field equation for $\hat{F}$ is

$$d * \hat{F} = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{F}^2, \quad (2.4)$$

or in components after dualizing

$$\hat{E}^{-1}\partial_M(\hat{E}\hat{F}^{MNPQ}) - \frac{1}{1152}\hat{e}^{NPQRSTUUVWXY}\hat{F}_{RSTU}\hat{F}_{VWXY} = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\hat{E} = \det \hat{e}_M^A$. The fivebrane soliton appears as a solution to the eleven-dimensional field equations and it couples to the dual seven-form field strength $\hat{F}_7 = *\hat{F}$. Equation (2.4) then becomes the Bianchi identity for the eleven-dimensional fivebrane.

This equation has in general gravitational Chern-Simons corrections associated to the sigma-model anomaly on the six-dimensional fivebrane worldvolume [22]. The corrected fivebrane Bianchi identity takes the form

$$d * \hat{F} = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{F}^2 + (2\pi)^4\beta X_8, \quad (2.6)$$

where β is related to the fivebrane tension by $T_6 = 1/(2\pi)^3\beta$. Henceforth we set $\beta = 1$. Since the gauge-fixed theory of the fivebrane is described by a chiral anti-self-dual tensor multiplet, the eight-form anomaly polynomial is expressed in terms of the Riemann tensor [23]

$$X_8 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \left(-\frac{1}{768}(\text{tr}\hat{R}^2)^2 + \frac{1}{192}\text{tr}\hat{R}^4 \right). \quad (2.7)$$

The anomaly leads to an additional term in the action (2.1)

$$\delta\mathcal{S}_{11} = \frac{1}{2} \int \hat{C} \wedge \left(-\frac{1}{768}(\text{tr}\hat{R}^2)^2 + \frac{1}{192}\text{tr}\hat{R}^4 \right). \quad (2.8)$$

The existence of this interaction can be verified by computing the one-point function of the two-form B_{MN} in the Type IIA string theory compactified on an eight-manifold [24]. The result of this calculation has no dilaton dependence, since this would spoil gauge

invariance. It can therefore be extrapolated to eleven dimensions and it gives the previous answer.

A supersymmetric configuration is one that obeys for some Majorana spinor η the conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\eta \hat{e}_M^A &= 0, \\ \delta_\eta \hat{C}_{MNP} &= 0, \\ \delta_\eta \psi_M &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.9}$$

Since in the background the spinor ψ_M vanishes, the first two of the above equations are satisfied, and only the gravitino equation remains to be solved

$$\hat{\nabla}_M \eta - \frac{1}{288} \left(\hat{\Gamma}_M{}^{PQRS} - 8\delta_M^P \hat{\Gamma}^{QRS} \right) \hat{F}_{PQRS} \eta = 0.\tag{2.10}$$

The most general ansatz for the metric, that is consistent with maximal symmetry is

$$\hat{g}_{MN}(x, y) = \Delta(y)^{-1} g_{MN}(x, y),\tag{2.11}$$

where

$$g_{MN}(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{\mu\nu}(x) & 0 \\ 0 & g_{mn}(y) \end{pmatrix}.\tag{2.12}$$

Here x are the three-dimensional external coordinates labeled by the indices $\mu, \nu, \dots$ and y the ones of the Euclidean eight-manifold labeled by $m, n, \dots$. $\Delta(y)$ is a scalar function called the “warp factor”. We first would like to rewrite (2.10) in terms of g_{MN} . We can relate covariant derivatives with respect to conformally transformed metrics by using the formula

$$\hat{\nabla}_M \eta = \nabla_M \eta + \frac{1}{2} \Omega^{-1} \Gamma_M{}^N (\nabla_N \Omega) \eta,\tag{2.13}$$

where $\hat{g}_{MN} = \Omega^2 g_{MN}$. This gives the relation

$$\hat{\nabla}_M \eta = \nabla_M \eta - \frac{1}{4} \Delta^{-1} \Gamma_M{}^N (\nabla_N \Delta) \eta.\tag{2.14}$$

Furthermore, $\hat{\Gamma}_M$ matrices are related to Γ_M matrices as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_M = \Delta^{-1/2} \Gamma_M \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Gamma}^M = \Delta^{1/2} \Gamma^M,\tag{2.15}$$

while $\hat{F}_{MNPQ}$ will be kept fixed under the transformation (2.11). We then obtain for (2.10) in terms of g_{MN} the result

$$\nabla_M \eta - \frac{1}{4} \Gamma_M{}^N \partial_N (\log \Delta) \eta - \frac{1}{288} \Delta^{3/2} (\Gamma_M{}^{PQRS} - 8 \delta_M^P \Gamma^{QRS}) F_{PQRS} \eta = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

We make a decomposition of the gamma matrices, that is appropriate to the $11 = 3 + 8$ split, by taking

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\mu &= \gamma_\mu \otimes \gamma_9, \\ \Gamma_m &= 1 \otimes \gamma_m, \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where γ_μ and γ_m are the gamma matrices of M^3 and K^8 respectively and γ_9 is the eight-dimensional chirality operator, that satisfies $\gamma_9^2 = 1$ and anti-commutes with all the γ_m 's.

We decompose the eleven-dimensional spinor η as a sum of terms of the form

$$\eta = \epsilon \otimes \xi, \quad (2.18)$$

where ϵ is a three-dimensional anticommuting spinor, while ξ is a commuting eight-dimensional Majorana-Weyl spinor. Spinors of the form (2.18), that solve $\delta_\eta \alpha = 0$ for every field α , give unbroken supersymmetries. In this section we shall be interested in compactifications having $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry in three dimensions for which two spinors on K^8 of the same chirality can be found. We can combine these real spinors into a complex spinor of a well defined chirality. Without loss of generality we will take the chirality to be positive. Compactifications for which spinors of the previous form can be found will, in general, have $\int X^8 \neq 0$.

In [25] it was shown, that demanding the existence of a nowhere-vanishing eight-dimensional Majorana-Weyl spinor in the 8_c representation of $SO(8)$ on a manifold with vanishing first Chern class gives a relation between the Euler character χ of the eight-manifold and the Pontryagin numbers, p_1 and p_2

$$p_1^2 - 4p_2 + 8\chi = 0. \quad (2.19)$$

The Pontryagin numbers are obtained by integrating the first and second Pontryagin forms [23]

$$P_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} R^2 \quad \text{and} \quad P_2 = -\frac{1}{4} \text{tr} R^4 + \frac{1}{8} (\text{tr} R^2)^2, \quad (2.20)$$

over K^8 . Replacing the spinor field in the 8_c representation by a spinor in the 8_s representation of $SO(8)$ corresponds to a change of sign in (2.19)

$$p_1^2 - 4p_2 - 8\chi = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Therefore, if one asks for the existence of an 8_c and an 8_s nowhere-vanishing spinor field on the internal manifold, one concludes, that the Euler character of K^8 has to vanish [25]. This observation will be relevant for section 3. However, it is also true that for every manifold having $-8\chi = p_1^2 - 4p_2$ we can find another one which has $8\chi = p_1^2 - 4p_2$, obtained by reversing the orientation of the original manifold. This corresponds to interchanging positive and negative chirality spinors.

Comparing (2.7) with (2.20) we observe that the anomaly polynomial X_8 is proportional to $P_1^2 - 4P_2$ and is therefore related to the Euler character of K^8

$$\int_{K^8} X_8 = -\frac{1}{4!(2\pi)^4} \chi, \quad (2.22)$$

which is a topological invariant. Finding nowhere-vanishing spinors of both chiralities as a solution of (2.16) thus implies, that the integral of the anomaly polynomial (2.22) vanishes and will be used later on. Some examples of compactifications of eleven-dimensional supergravity on eight-manifolds of this type have been considered in [26]. For these compactifications no warp factor has been taken into account and the internal manifold is of the form $K^2 \times K^6$, where K^2 is a two-dimensional sphere or torus and K^6 is a six-dimensional Calabi-Yau manifold. They yield non-vanishing expectation values for the four-form field strength, if the external space is anti-de Sitter and have an $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetry in three dimensions. As was shown in [10] and [27] the situation is rather different, if the anomaly is taken into account. In this case one can find solutions, that preserve an $\mathcal{N} = 2, 1$ supersymmetry respectively, if the external space is three-dimensional Minkowski space, while the four-form field strength gets a non-vanishing expectation value. Furthermore, we shall see in the next section, that if the internal manifold is non-compact it is also possible to preserve an $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ supersymmetry, while non-vanishing expectation values for tensor fields are still present.

In compactifications with maximally symmetric three-dimensional space-time the non-vanishing components of F_4 are

$$\begin{aligned} F_{mnpq} & \text{ arbitrary,} \\ F_{\mu\nu\rho m} & = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} f_m. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

In order to compare with the results of the next section, let us briefly summarize the conditions imposed by $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry. First, some of the internal components of the flux (and their complex conjugates) have to vanish $F_{1,3} = F_{4,0} = 0$. The only non-vanishing (internal) component of the flux is of type $(2, 2)$ and satisfies the primitivity condition

$$F \wedge J = 0, \tag{2.24}$$

where J is the Kähler form. The internal manifold is not Kähler but conformal to a Calabi-Yau four-fold with the warp factor satisfying the equation

$$d * d \log \Delta = \frac{1}{3} F \wedge F - \frac{2}{3} (2\pi)^4 X_8. \tag{2.25}$$

The external component of the flux is related to the warp factor

$$F_{\mu\nu\rho m} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} \partial_m \Delta^{-3/2}. \tag{2.26}$$

These are all the constraints imposed by $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry. Similar constraints for compactifications with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in three dimensions were derived in [27]. Finally, to compare with the more generic situation of the next section, let us remark, that in [28] it was found, that there are some solutions to the equations of motion, which break supersymmetry and yet lead to a vanishing cosmological constant. Any self-dual flux will be a solution to the equations of motion, which means that its internal component is of the form

$$F = F_{4,0} + F_{0,4} + F_{2,2} + J \wedge J F_{0,0}, \tag{2.27}$$

where $F_{2,2}$ is a primitive $(2, 2)$ form. Only the second term will preserve supersymmetry and yet all the components of the flux above are allowed by the equations of motion. This situation will be different in the next section, where we will see that we can have anti-self

dual fluxes on a Calabi-Yau four-fold (or via orientation reversal, self-dual fluxes with right handed covariantly constant spinors), where we still find that the flux has to be of the (2,2) type, except now they will be of the form $F = F_{(1,1)} \wedge J$. This is not in contradiction with [28] as one of the assumptions that went into showing that the equations of motion require fluxes to be self-dual on a Calabi-Yau four-fold (where the nowhere vanishing complex, chiral spinor carried positive chirality), was that the manifold was compact, which we shall show is not satisfied for our case.

2.2. Non-Chiral Spinors on the Internal Space

Let us now explore, how the previous results change, if we choose spinors on the internal manifold of non definite chirality. Compactifying again to three-dimensional Minkowski space the external component of the gravitino supersymmetry transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\psi_\mu = & \nabla_\mu \eta - \frac{1}{288} \Delta^{3/2} (\gamma_\mu \otimes \gamma_9 \gamma^{mnpq}) F_{mnpq} \eta \\ & + \frac{1}{6} \Delta^{3/2} (\gamma_\mu \otimes \gamma^m) f_m \eta \\ & - \frac{1}{4} \partial_n (\log \Delta) (\gamma_\mu \otimes \gamma_9 \gamma^n) \eta, \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

leads to the following equation

$$F\xi - 48 \gamma^m (-\gamma^9 f_m + \partial_m \Delta^{-3/2}) \xi = 0. \quad (2.29)$$

Here F denotes the contraction of the internal flux component with the antisymmetrized product of four gamma matrices $F = F_{pqrs} \gamma^{pqrs}$ and $p, q, \dots$ denote real coordinates. Notice, that here F is not the four-form introduced in the previous section. Nevertheless, it should be clear from the context, what F is referring to. In the previous formula we have used a complex spinor ξ of indefinite chirality. We can decompose ξ into its positive and negative chirality part

$$\xi = \xi_+ + \xi_-, \quad (2.30)$$

by using the chirality projection operators

$$P_\pm \xi = \frac{1}{2} (1 \pm \gamma^9) \xi. \quad (2.31)$$

Acting with these operators on equation (2.29) we get the following result for the positive and negative component of ξ

$$F \xi_{\pm} = \not{a}_{\pm} \xi_{\mp}. \quad (2.32)$$

Here we have introduced the notation

$$\not{a}_{\pm} = \gamma^m a_m^{\pm} = 48 \gamma^m (\pm f_m + \partial_m \Delta^{-3/2}). \quad (2.33)$$

We can reduce these equations to determining equations for the self-dual and anti-self-dual part of F

$$G_{pqrs}^{\pm} = F_{pqrs} \pm * F_{pqrs}, \quad (2.34)$$

which take the form

$$G_p^{\pm} \xi_{\pm} = G_{pqrs}^{\pm} \gamma^{qrs} \xi_{\pm} = \gamma_p \frac{1}{4} \not{a}_{\pm} \xi_{\mp}. \quad (2.35)$$

The upper sign determines the self-dual part of F , while the lower sign determines its anti-self-dual part. Thus, these are two of the general equations, that need to be solved to determine the supersymmetry constraints. Equivalently, we can rewrite these equations in a way, that will be useful in order to simplify the internal component of the gravitino transformation

$$F_n \xi_{\pm} = \gamma_n \frac{1}{8} \not{a}_{\pm} \xi_{\mp} + \frac{1}{2} G_n^{\mp} \xi_{\pm}. \quad (2.36)$$

Let us now have a look at the other two equations, which come from the internal component of the gravitino supersymmetry transformation. Using some gamma matrix algebra these can be written as

$$\nabla_m \tilde{\xi} + \frac{1}{24} \Delta^{3/2} F_m \tilde{\xi} + \frac{1}{4} \Delta^{3/2} f_n \gamma_m^n \gamma_9 \tilde{\xi} = 0, \quad (2.37)$$

where $F_m = F_{mpqr} \gamma^{pqr}$ and we have rescaled the spinor $\xi = \Delta^{-1/4} \tilde{\xi}$. Writing this in terms of negative and positive chirality spinors we obtain

$$\nabla_m \tilde{\xi}_{\pm} + \frac{1}{24} \Delta^{3/2} F_m \tilde{\xi}_{\mp} \pm \frac{1}{4} \Delta^{3/2} f_n \gamma_m^n \tilde{\xi}_{\pm} = 0. \quad (2.38)$$

After rescaling the internal metric $\tilde{g}_{mn} = \Delta^{-3/2} g_{mn}$ and using equation (2.36) we can write the final expression for the equations coming from the internal component of the gravitino as

$$\tilde{\nabla}_m \tilde{\xi}_{\pm} + \frac{1}{192} \Delta^{3/2} a_m^{\mp} \tilde{\xi}_{\pm} + \frac{1}{48} \Delta^{-3/4} G_m^{\pm} \tilde{\xi}_{\mp} = 0. \quad (2.39)$$

So, to summarize, this equation together with (2.32) in terms of the rescaled metric

$$\tilde{F}\tilde{\xi}_{\pm} = \tilde{\gamma}^{mnpq}F_{mnpq}\tilde{\xi}_{\pm} = \Delta^{9/4}\tilde{\phi}_{\pm}\xi_{\mp}, \quad (2.40)$$

need to be solved to find the constraints on the fluxes and the internal manifold. From now on we shall consider the case, where the internal fluxes are self-dual

$$G_{pqrs}^{-} = 0. \quad (2.41)$$

In this case there is a relation between the external component of the flux and the warp factor

$$f_m = \partial_m \Delta^{-3/2}, \quad (2.42)$$

which leads to $\phi_- = 0$ and

$$\phi_+ = 96 \gamma^m \partial_m \Delta^{-3/2}. \quad (2.43)$$

For convenience we will rescale the spinor ξ_- again

$$\xi'_- = \Delta^{-3/4}\xi_-, \quad (2.44)$$

as the equations then simplify further. For these self-dual solutions there are three equations, that need to be solved

$$F_n \xi_+ + \frac{1}{8} \gamma_n \phi_+ \xi_- = 0, \quad (2.45)$$

which comes from the external component of the gravitino, while the internal component gives two further equations

$$\nabla_m \xi_+ + \frac{1}{24} F_m \xi_- = 0, \quad (2.46)$$

and

$$\nabla_m \xi_- = 0. \quad (2.47)$$

This expression implies, that the spinor ξ_- is covariantly constant. If ξ_- happens to vanish everywhere, then we get back the flux conditions of [10], by analysing equations (2.46) and (2.45). Since we are looking to generalise the analysis in [10], we shall therefore

take ξ_- to be nowhere vanishing, which is the only other possibility. Furthermore, we have dropped the tildes and primes from the spinors and gamma matrices in order to simplify the notation. From the previous two equations we make two observations. First, from (2.47) we see, that we have found a spinor, ξ_- , that is covariantly constant. If this spinor is complex we are dealing with a conformally Calabi-Yau manifold, while if the imaginary part of ξ_- vanishes, it is possible to derive from the above equations a generalization of the supersymmetry constraints for a Spin(7) holonomy manifold computed in [27]. We will elaborate on this a little bit more in a moment. Second, if the spinors ξ_+ and ξ_- are both nowhere vanishing it implies according to [25], that the Euler characteristic of the internal manifold is zero. Thus, in order to obtain non-trivial solutions, where fluxes are turned on, we need to consider non-compact internal manifolds or we need to take sources into account. However, in general, ξ_+ can have zeros, so that the Euler character of the internal manifold does not vanish.

Due to the existence of these two spinors we can define (for an appropriate normalization of the spinors) a vector field on our internal manifold as follows

$$v_n = \xi_+^\dagger \gamma_n \xi_-, \quad (2.48)$$

where $n = 3, \dots, 10$ runs over the internal coordinates. Here we have combined the two spinors on our manifold (we are dealing with $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry) into a complex spinor, whose chiral parts we called ξ_+ and ξ_- as before. In case, that the covariantly constant spinor is real, we have a manifold, that is conformal to a Spin(7) holonomy manifold. We will work out the generalization of the supersymmetry constraints derived in [27] at the end of this section. In writing the vector field as above, we have chosen a normalization of $1/8$ for the spinor ξ_- . Fierz identities imply, that the positive chirality spinor can be written in terms of this vector field

$$\xi_+ = v^n \gamma_n \xi_-. \quad (2.49)$$

Using this expression for the positive chirality spinor and (2.45), (2.46) and (2.47) we obtain the following two equations, which are defined only in terms of the negative chirality spinor ξ_-

$$[\gamma_n (\nabla_m v^n) + \frac{1}{24} F_m] \xi_- = 0, \quad (2.50)$$

and

$$[F_m v^n \gamma_n + \frac{1}{8} \gamma_m] \phi_+ \xi_- = 0. \quad (2.51)$$

We can now introduce complex coordinates and take into account, that ξ_- is annihilated by $\gamma_{\bar{a}}$

$$\gamma_{\bar{a}} \xi_- = \gamma^a \xi_- = 0. \quad (2.52)$$

From equation (2.13) we get several constraints on the fluxes. First, the $(2, 2)$ part of the flux is no longer primitive but satisfies the condition

$$\nabla_a v_{\bar{b}} + \frac{1}{8} F_{a\bar{b}c\bar{d}} J^{c\bar{d}} = 0. \quad (2.53)$$

This can be written equivalently as

$$F \wedge J + *dv = 0, \quad (2.54)$$

where we have rescaled v with a factor $15/8$. This equation is a determining equation for the fundamental form J , once the vector field is specified (Note that equation (2.53) implies that the vector field is Killing, since equation (2.53) tells us that the symmetric part $\nabla_{(a} v_{\bar{b})}$ as well as the part $\nabla_a v_b$ both vanish, which is equivalent to the Killing constraint. In fact this defines a holomorphic Killing vector, though we will not make use of it here. There is another constraint on v coming from the external component of the gravitino equation, which we'll examine below) and the fluxes are given. It is a generalization of the primitivity condition (2.24) obeyed by the fluxes for the case, that the spinors on the internal space are no longer chiral.

Furthermore, it is easy to see, that as in the case of chiral spinors, the $(4, 0)$ and $(3, 1)$ parts of the flux (and its complex conjugate) have to vanish

$$F_{(4,0)} = F_{(3,1)} = 0, \quad (2.55)$$

while the derivative of the vector field with respect to the complex conjugate coordinate vanishes

$$\nabla_{\bar{a}} v_{\bar{b}} = 0. \quad (2.56)$$

Finally, we can derive the determining equation of the vector field by using (2.45). This leads to the following equation

$$(F_{mnpq}v_r\gamma^{npq}\gamma^r + 12\gamma_m\gamma_n\partial^n\Delta^{-3/2})\xi_- = 0. \quad (2.57)$$

Using formula (2.56), some gamma matrix algebra and taking into account, that the gamma matrices act as raising and lowering operators, allows us to write the above expression in the following form

$$\partial_m\Delta^{-3/2} - 8v^n\partial_{[m}v_{n]} = 0. \quad (2.58)$$

Equation (2.58) determines the vector field v_m , as the warp factor can be computed in terms of the internal component of the flux through equation (2.25).

If we reversed the orientation of our manifold, then the above equations would be left unchanged, except that, now the flux would be required to be anti-self dual, while the covariantly constant spinor would have positive(left) chirality. Then, the content of our equations would be that the $(4, 0)$ and $(3, 1)$ part of the flux vanish, while the $(2, 2)$ part of the flux is non-primitive, and being anti-self dual, must be of the form $F_{(1,1)} \wedge J$ as claimed before. This is the picture we'll have in mind when we refer to the flux as being non-primitive. That is, we will talk about our internal manifold, carrying anti self-dual fluxes, with the covariantly constant spinors being of positive(left) chirality, as is conventional.

In order that the equation (2.54) properly generalise the solution of [10], it must be that, when the internal manifold is compact, this solution must go back to the flux condition in [10]. This is because, for a compact four-fold, the superpotential, and hence the equations of motion can be deduced from a dimensional reduction of the 11D action (2.1) as was done in [29]. That the internal manifold cannot be compact can be seen as follows. Firstly, we have a Killing vector on a ricci-flat manifold. If the manifold also happens to be compact, then such a vector is also covariantly constant. Secondly, a manifold whose holonomy is $SU(4)$, and not a proper subgroup of it, does not admit covariantly constant vectors (since under the holonomy group, $SO(8)$ decomposes as $8 = 4 + \bar{4}$, which does not contain a singlet). For more details on this proof, refer to [30]. Another way to see this same result is to note that, when the manifold is compact, the equations of motion analysed in [28] imply that the internal flux has to be self-dual (with the orientation determined by

the holomorphic 4-form). However, our starting point was the assumption that the flux was anti-self dual, and hence this implies the internal flux vanishes, leading to constant warp factor.

To summarize: Assuming that the fluxes on our internal manifold are (anti)self-dual, we have shown, that the internal manifold is conformal to a Calabi-Yau four-fold (2.47), with two spinors of non-definite chirality, whose (left)right chiral parts are covariantly constant. The only non-vanishing component of the flux is the (2, 2) component, which is no longer primitive (2.54), (2.55) but still preserves supersymmetry. Equation (2.58) determines the vector field, while the warp factor is determined by (2.25).

Let us now derive the generalization of the supersymmetry constraints for the Spin(7) holonomy case considered in [27]. First, from (2.50) we have a

$$[\gamma_n(\nabla_m \epsilon^n) + \frac{1}{24} F_m] \xi_- = 0. \quad (2.59)$$

Multiplying (2.59) with $\xi_-^T \gamma^a$ we get

$$\nabla_k \epsilon^m + \frac{1}{24} F_{knpq} \Omega^{mnpq} = 0, \quad (2.60)$$

where $\Omega^{mnpq} = \xi_-^T \gamma^{mnpq} \xi_- / \xi_-^T \xi_-$ is the self-dual four-form of the internal space. Substituting for $\nabla_m \epsilon_n$ in (2.59) using (2.60), and multiplying the resulting expression by γ_m and observing that the flux is anti self-dual while the real four form Ω is self-dual, we get:

$$F_{pqr[m} \Omega_n^{pqr} = 0. \quad (2.61)$$

$$\nabla_{[m} \epsilon_{n]} = 0. \quad (2.62)$$

From (2.62) and (2.60), we can see that the other constraint can be cast into the following equation:

$$\nabla_{(k} \epsilon_{m)} + \frac{1}{24} F_{npq(k} \Omega_{m)}^{npq} = 0, \quad (2.63)$$

In order to recover the equations derived in [27], we need to go back to equation (2.47) and set $\xi_- = 0$. In equation (2.47), we had a choice of setting ξ_- zero everywhere, or nowhere zero. It is the former choice that gives us the flux conditions of [10] and it is straightforward to check that it does. If we set $v = 0$ in our equations, we would not get back [10]. Instead,

we should end up with zero flux and constant warp factor, as can be easily checked, both in equations (2.54) and (2.58), as well as in equations (2.61), and (2.63). To be more precise, note that (2.54) and (2.55) together imply that the flux is primitive and of type (2,2), when v vanishes. On a Calabi-Yau four-fold, the primitive (2,2) forms are self-dual, this means our flux has to be self-dual to solve the equations for supersymmetry. However, by assumption, our fluxes were anti self-dual, which means that in order to preserve supersymmetry the flux has to vanish.

Another point to note, is that the conditions given in equations (2.61), (2.62) and (2.60) must also be solved by the ansatz we had in the previous section, when the manifold was a Calabi-Yau four-fold. It is easy to check that this is indeed the case, once we notice that if the vector field ϵ is given by $\epsilon_m = i(v_m - \bar{v}_m)$, then all the relevant equations are automatically satisfied. This is because among the content of the $N = 2$ supersymmetry constraints was the fact that the vector field v was real, which means ϵ vanishes. We in fact used this in writing (2.56) in the form of (2.54).

Finally, let us remark that the form of the fluxes which solve the equations of motion are no longer of the form (2.27). This is because we are no longer dealing with a compact manifold, and the assumptions that went into showing that the fluxes has to be self-dual on a Calabi-Yau four-fold [28] are not satisfied for our case, allowing us to have anti self-dual fluxes on a Calabi-Yau four-fold and still solve the equations of motion. However, the presence of a flux of (3,1) type breaks supersymmetry while a (2,2) flux of the form $F_{(1,1)} \wedge J$ preserves supersymmetry.

3. Example: PP-Waves and $\mathcal{M}$ -Theory

By restricting ourselves to solutions for which the internal fluxes are self-dual, we have managed to make the problem of solving the gravitino equations tractable. In this case we end up with manifolds with special holonomy as in [10] but as we can see from the above derivation the flux conditions obeyed by our models are different from the ones considered in [10]. In particular, the internal fluxes are constrained to be of the (2,2) form, but no longer have to be primitive. We now would like to consider a particular example of this more general class of models.

More concretely, we would like to consider an example constructed in [11] where the internal manifold is flat R^8 , thus retaining maximal supersymmetry. This solution arises as the $\mathcal{M}$ -theory lift (by performing a timelike T-duality) of the supersymmetric PP-wave solution, which comes from the Penrose limit of the $AdS_5 \times S_5$ compactification of the Type IIB theory. As noticed in [11] this model does not obey the flux constraints derived in [10] but we shall see, that the supersymmetry constraints derived in the previous section are satisfied. The reason for this is, of course, that the spinors on the internal manifold used in [11] are not chiral. In the following we will use the notation and conventions of [11].

The lift of the Type IIB PP-wave solution to $\mathcal{M}$ -theory has a metric of the form of a deformed M2-brane

$$ds_{11}^2 = H^{-2/3}(-dt^2 + dx_1^2 + dx_2^2) + H^{1/3}\Sigma_i dz_i^2, \quad (3.1)$$

where H is the warp factor and the coordinates, z_i with $i = 1, \dots, 8$ run over the internal manifold, which is flat and t, x_1, x_2 describe the three-dimensional external space. The fluxes are of the form

$$F = dt \wedge dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge dH^{-1} + \mu \Phi_{(4)}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\Phi_{(4)} = \Phi_{mnpq}$ is the self-dual flux on R^8 , which is assumed to be constant in order to preserve all the supersymmetry

$$\Phi_{(4)} = dz^1 \wedge dz^2 \wedge dz^3 \wedge dz^4 + dz^5 \wedge dz^6 \wedge dz^7 \wedge dz^8, \quad (3.3)$$

and μ is a constant. The warp factor satisfies the equation of motion

$$\Delta H = -\frac{1}{48}\mu^2\Phi_{(4)}^2. \quad (3.4)$$

Here one has to take into account, that in this example two no-where vanishing spinors can be found (as we shall see below), so that according to [25], the Euler characteristic of the internal manifold is zero. Thus, in order to obtain non-trivial solutions, where fluxes are turned on, one needs to consider non-compact internal manifolds, in this case flat R^8 .

As shown by [11], the gravitino supersymmetry equations are satisfied by making the following ansatz for the internal spinor

$$\epsilon = H^{-1/6}(\nabla_i H W \gamma^i - H^{1/2})\eta, \quad (3.5)$$

where $W = \Phi_{ijkm}\gamma^{ijkm}$ and η is a constant spinor of negative chirality. From the above equations we can determine the vector field, that arises in our equation (2.49). To do so, notice the expressions for the spinors are $\xi_- = \eta$ and $\xi_+ = \frac{W\gamma^i\nabla_i H\eta}{4\mu}$. This leads to the following equation for the vector field

$$v_i = \frac{\nabla^j H \eta^\dagger \gamma_i W \gamma_j \eta}{4\mu}. \quad (3.6)$$

Differentiating the above expression, antisymmetrizing and noting, that F is related to $\Phi_{(4)}$ by the proportionality constant μ , gives us the condition found in the last section, that replaces primitivity

$$*dv + F \wedge J = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

In the last step we have absorbed a factor of $3/4$ into the definition of v . It can also be seen, that the determining equation for the vector field is satisfied. The easiest way to check this is to substitute the expression for ξ_+ into (2.45) and taking into account, that $H = \Delta^{3/2}$ in our notation. Finally, we must point out that it is possible to choose complex coordinates in the above example in terms of which, the internal flux is a $(2, 2)$ form, and this also allows us to show that the equations for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry are satisfied.

So we conclude, that the deformed M2-brane constructed in [11] arises as a special case of our general set of models, by setting the internal manifold to be flat. Using the constraints, that we derived in the previous sections, more examples of models satisfying our equations could be constructed. The above example was one that retained a lot of supersymmetry, and it would be interesting to know if there do exist solutions with precisely $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry, that satisfy our constraints. It is clear that such solutions will have to describe non-compact internal manifolds.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Compactifications with non-vanishing fluxes are a rather fascinating area of recent research, as they allow us to approach and even solve one longstanding problem in string theory, the moduli space problem. The simplest type of such models correspond to $\mathcal{M}$ -theory compactifications on non-Kähler conformally Calabi-Yau manifolds, that have four

complex dimensions. In this case two covariantly constant Majorana-Weyl spinors on the internal space can be found. The constraints obeyed by the fluxes and the geometry were derived in [10] and [18]. Similarly, having only one covariantly constant spinor of definite chirality leads to the supersymmetry constraints obeyed by manifolds, that are conformal to Spin(7) holonomy manifolds [27]. See also [31], where it is shown that fluxes of the form $(4, 0)$ and $(0, 0)$ can break $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry into $\mathcal{N} = 1$.

In this note we have relaxed the assumption regarding the chirality of the spinors on the internal manifold for compactification of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory to three-dimensional Minkowski space-time with $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2$ supersymmetry and have solved the supersymmetry constraints for a special class of manifolds, that arise, when we drop the chirality assumption, yet retain the assumption, that the internal fluxes are self-dual. The resulting class of manifolds includes constructions like the models [11], where the Type IIB PP -wave is lifted to $\mathcal{M}$ -theory as a deformed membrane. If we remove the self-duality assumption on the fluxes we expect to get the most general class of $\mathcal{M}$ -theory compactifications to three flat dimensions. We expect, that the dual description of the Polchinski-Strassler model would lie in this class of solutions. This would be helpful in order to find the complete form of the Polchinski-Strassler model, as to this date only the first orders in perturbation theory are known. Approaching this problem from the Type IIB side, where the work of [32] needs to be generalized by allowing spinors of non-definite chirality on the internal space, might be the easiest way to proceed. The recent paper of [20] should be rather interesting for this purpose, as they have obtained the most general $\mathcal{M}$ -theory compactifications preserving $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry. In the case of more general compactifications, it is no longer clear, that the internal manifold is even a complex manifold. Also, if we relax the assumption of self-duality, then we do not expect to end up with manifolds of special holonomy. In that case we would have to seek a classification of the manifold in terms of G -structures. A general discussion of G -structures, and their relevance to Type IIB compactifications with NS-fluxes, is provided in [33]. Classification of the most general supersymmetric geometries from the $\mathcal{M}$ -theory side was performed in [34] using G -structures.

Acknowledgement

We thank K. Dasgupta, S. Kachru, A. Krause, J. Polchinski and M. Strassler for useful discussions on related subjects. The work of K.B. was supported by the NSF under grant PHY-0244722, an Alfred Sloan Fellowship and the University of Utah. The work of M.B and R.S. was supported by NSF under grant PHY-01-5-23911, an Alfred Sloan Fellowship and the University of Maryland.

Appendix

In this appendix we would like to collect a few useful formulas and we would like to explain our notation.

- ▷ The different types of indices that we use are

$M, N, \dots$ are eleven-dimensional indices

$m, n, \dots$ denote eight-dimensional indices

$\mu, \nu, \dots$ are the indices of the external space

- ▷ n -forms are defined with a factor $1/n!$.

For example

$$F = \frac{1}{4!} F_{mnpq} dx^m \wedge dx^n \wedge dx^p \wedge dx^q.$$

- ▷ The gamma matrices Γ_M are hermitian while Γ_0 is antihermitian. They satisfy

$$\{\Gamma_M, \Gamma_N\} = 2g_{MN}.$$

- ▷ $\Gamma_{M_1 \dots M_n}$ is the antisymmetrized product of gamma matrices

$$\Gamma_{M_1 \dots M_n} = \Gamma_{[M_1 \dots M_n]}$$

where the square bracket implies a sum over $n!$ terms with a $1/n!$ prefactor.

- ▷ Gamma matrix identities that are useful are

$$[\gamma_m, \gamma^r] = 2\gamma_m{}^r$$

$$[\gamma_{mnp}, \gamma^{rs}] = 12\delta_{[m}{}^{[r} \gamma_{np]}{}^{s]}$$

$$\{\gamma_{mnpq}, \gamma^{rst}\} = 2\gamma_{mnpq}{}^{rst} - 72\delta_{[mn}{}^{[rs} \gamma_{pq]}{}^{t]}$$

▷ Our definition of Hodge $\star$ in d dimensions is

$$\star(dx^{m_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{m_p}) = \frac{|g|^{1/2}}{(d-p)!} \epsilon^{m_1 \dots m_p}_{m_{p+1} \dots m_d} dx^{m_{p+1}} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{m_d},$$

where

$$\epsilon_{m_1 m_2 \dots m_d} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{any two indices repeated} \\ +1 & \text{even permutation} \\ -1 & \text{odd permutation} \end{cases}$$

▷ The identity which relates covariant derivatives of spinors with respect to conformally transformed metrics is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla}_M \epsilon &= \nabla_M \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \Omega^{-1} \Gamma_M^N (\nabla_N \Omega) \epsilon, \\ \tilde{g}_{MN} &= \Omega^2 g_{MN}. \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] B. De Wit, H. Nicolai and N. P. Warner, “The embedding of Gauged $N = 8$ Supergravity into $d = 11$ Supergravity, *Nucl. Phys.* **B255** (29) 1985.
- [2] A. Strominger, “Superstrings with Torsion”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B274** (253) 1986.
- [3] B. de Wit, D. J. Smit and N. D. Hari Dass, “Residual Supersymmetry of Compactified $D = 10$ Supergravity”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B283** (1987) 165.
- [4] K. Becker and K. Dasgupta, “Heterotic Strings with Torsion,” JHEP **0211**, 006 (2002), hep-th/0209077.
- [5] K. Becker, M. Becker, K. Dasgupta and S. Prokushkin, “Properties of Heterotic Vacua from Superpotentials,” hep-th/0304001.
- [6] K. Becker, M. Becker, K. Dasgupta and P. S. Green, “Compactifications of Heterotic Theory on non-Kaehler Complex Manifolds. I,” JHEP **0304**, 007 (2003), hep-th/0301161.
- [7] S. Ashok and M. R. Douglas “Counting Flux Vacua”, hep-th/0307049.
- [8] E. Goldstein and S. Prokushkin, “Geometric Model for Complex non-Kaehler Manifolds with $SU(3)$ Structure,” hep-th/0212307.
- [9] G. L. Cardoso, G. Curio, G. Dall’Agata, D. Lust, P. Manousselis and G. Zoupanos, “Non-Kähler String Backgrounds and their Five Torsion Classes,” hep-th/0211118.
- [10] K. Becker and M. Becker, “ $\mathcal{M}$ -Theory on Eight Manifolds”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B477** (1996) 155, hep-th/9605053.
- [11] M. Cvetič, H. Lu and C. N. Pope, “Penrose Limits, PP-Waves and Deformed M2-Branes”, hep-th/0203082.
- [12] J. Polchinski and M. J. Strassler, “The String Dual of a Confining Four-Dimensional Gauge Theory”, hep-th/0003136.
- [13] I. R. Klebanov and E. Witten, “Superconformal Field Theory on Threebranes at a Calabi-Yau Singularity”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B536** (1998) 199, hep-th/9807080.
- [14] I. R. Klebanov and A. A. Tseytlin, “Gravity Duals of Supersymmetric $SU(N) \times SU(N + M)$ Gauge Theories”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B578** (2000) 123.
- [15] I. R. Klebanov and M. J. Strassler, “Supergravity and a Confining Gauge Theory: Duality Cascades and χ SB-Resolution of Naked Singularities”, JHEP **0008** (052) 2000, hep-th/0007191.
- [16] M. Graña and J. Polchinski, “Supersymmetric 3-Form Flux and Perturbations of $AdS(5)$ ”, hep-th/0009211.
- [17] S. S. Gubser, “Supersymmetry and F-Theory Realization of the Deformed Conifold with 3-Form Flux”, hep-th/0010010.
- [18] S. Sethi, C. Vafa and E. Witten, “Constraints on Low Dimensional String compactification”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B480** (1996) 213, hep-th/9606122.

- [19] D. Martelli and J. Sparks, “G-Structures, Fluxes and Calibrations in M-theory”, hep-th/0306225.
- [20] A. R. Frey and M. Graña, “Type IIB Solutions with Interpolating Supersymmetries”, hep-th/0307142.
- [21] E. J. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, “Supergravity Theory in 11 Dimensions”, *Phys. Lett.* **B5** (1978) 409.
- [22] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and R. Minasian, “Eleven Dimensional Origin of String/String Duality: A One Loop Test”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B452** (1995) 261.
- [23] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and E. Witten, “Gravitational Anomalies”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B234** (1983) 269.
- [24] C. Vafa and E. Witten, “A One-Loop Test of String Duality”, *Nucl. Phys.* **B447** (1995) 261.
- [25] C. J. Isham and C. N. Pope, “Nowhere-vanishing Spinors and Topological Obstruction to the Equivalence of the NSR and GS Superstrings”, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **5** (1988) 257; C. J. Isham, C. N. Pope and N. P. Warner, “Nowhere-vanishing Spinors and Triality Rotations in 8-Manifolds”, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **5** (1988) 1297.
- [26] C. N. Pope and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Compactifications of $d = 11$ Supergravity on Kähler Manifolds”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **122** (1989) 281.
- [27] K. Becker, “A Note on Compactifications on Spin(7) Holonomy Manifolds”, JHEP **0105** (003) 2001, hep-th/0011114.
- [28] K. Becker and M. Becker, “Supersymmetry Breaking, $\mathcal{M}$ -Theory and Fluxes”, JHEP 0107:038, 2001, hep-th/0107044.
- [29] M. Haack and J. Louis, “M-theory compactified on Calabi-Yau fourfolds with background flux”, *Phys. Lett. B* **507**, 296 (2001), hep-th/0103068.
- [30] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz and E. Witten, “Superstring Theory. Vol. 2: Loop Amplitudes, Anomalies And Phenomenology”
- [31] M. Berg, M. Haack and H. Samtleben, “Calabi-Yau fourfolds with flux and supersymmetry breaking”, JHEP **0304**, 046 (2003), hep-th/0212255
- [32] K. Dasgupta, G. Rajesh and S. Sethi, “M-theory, Orientifolds and G-Flux”, JHEP **9908** (023) 1999, hep-th/9908088.
- [33] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, S. Pakis and D. Waldram, “G-structures and wrapped NS5-branes”, hep-th/0205050
- [34] J. P. Gauntlett and S. Pakis, “The geometry of $D = 11$ Killing spinors”, JHEP **0304**, 039 (2003), hep-th/0212008.